SPEECH OF MR. HUNT, OF LOUISIANA.

ON THE NEBRASKA QUESTION. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 23, 1854.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union-

Mr. BUNT said: Mr. Chairman, I rise under a deep sense of public duty to address the committee on the bill to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. In expressing my sentiments, sir, I will speak in the spirit of a national representative, freely and independently, uninfluenced by sectional prejudices, unmoved by clamor here or elsewhere, with a mind intent upon the right, and anxious to promote the best interests of the country, to secure its peace and harmony, and to perpetuate the union of these States. Trammeled by a restriction of this House injurious to free discussion, I will be compelled to that I may not be interrupted, unless, unhappily and against my predetermination, I should say nught which may wound the sensibilities or touch the sense of honor

of any gentleman on this floor.

The bill proposes a repeal of the Misseuri compromise. I am opposed to a repeal as violative of good faith, as contrary to the true policy of the country, as engendering discord and dissension among the people of the different sections of the country, and putting to hazard the permanency of this blessed and glorious Union.

To develop my views clearly it will be necessary to ad- the notice of the House is Charles Pinckney, of South vert to the history of the compromise, and to show its Carolina: true character.

In 1818 a bill authorizing the people of the Territory failed by a disagreement of the two Houses on the sub-The House of Representatives was in favor of a clause in the bill containing the ordinance of 1787, while the Senate was opposed to that clause.

At the next session, in December, 1819, the people of Missouri presented a memorial to Congress praying to be authorised to held a convention to form a constitution and State government, as preliminary to the decision of Congress on the admission of Wissouri Congress of Wissouri Congress on the admission of Congress on the admission of Wissouri Congress on the admission of Congress on the admission of Congres gress on the admission of Missouri. Simultaneously the people of Maine applied for the admission of Maine as a State into the Union. At that time the public mind had been aroused and excited on the subject of slavery. The slavery into Missouri and the other partion of the Louisiana Territory. The debates in Congress were of the most violent and prejudiced character. The passions of both parties were exasperated and inflamed by heated and aerimonious discussions. This state of bad feeling was increased by the opposite views of the two Houses of Cougress. A majority of the House was for a restriction of the admission of slavery; but a majority of the Senate was opposed to any such restriction. The patriots of the country began to tremble for our liberties, for that Union which is their only guaranty and safeguard. In a letter written at the time by Mr. Jefferson, he says

"The Missouri question is the most portenous one which ever yet threatened our Union. In the gloomiest moment of olutionary war I never had any approhension equal to

In this critical and truly alarming condition of public feeling, under the dispensation of an all-wise and kind Providence, the virtue of the republic manifested itself in a southing and benign spirit of compromise. The Senate, with a view to induce or coerce the House to consent to the admission of Missouri without a restriction on slavery, had connected the bill for the admission of Maine, favored by the House, with the Missouri bill be-fore mentioned. But now committees of conference were called to achieve the patriotic work of compromise and union; and Mr. Clay informs us"It was finally settled to disconnect the two bills; to ad

mit Maine separately, without any connexion with Missouri and to insert in the Missouri bill a clause proposed by Mr Thomas, of Illinois, in the Senate, restricting the admission bill was fibally passed. The committees of conference of the two Houses recommended the detachment of the two bills, So it passed. So it went to Missouri. So it for a time quiet-

This, sir, in my judgment, was the first Missouri com-This, sir, in my judgment, was the descriversy of the promise—the great settlement of the controversy of the North and the South on the subject of slavery. It satisfied the North because it prohibited slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of \$6° 30'. It satisfied the South because it left slavery open south of \$6° \$0' for admission, and because it laid a basis for the admission of Missouri into the Union without the restriction of slavery; tion, with at any clause in it restrictive of slavery, with a measure advocated by the leading members of the South

souri, whom it authorized to form a State Constitution tative. without the restriction of slavery; and it was a concession to the North by the South, which originally contended for the admission of slavery into the entire Louisiana Terri-Clay, if he were here, would raise his voice in favor of tory, Missouri included.

I have called this compromise the first Missouri compromise : and I desire to add, if at the expense of repetition, that it is, in truth and in popular understanding and acceptation, the chief; the real, the substantial Missouri compromise; and that it is known and designated as such, not only in common parlance, but in the writings and speeches of our statesmen, orators, and other public

It has been said that there were no parties who could make a compromise. I think I have already, in the course of my remarks, shown the error of this assertion. But, for a more direct reply to it, I will relieve and gratify the House by reading the remarks of Mr. Clay in his speech on the late compromise measures, in answer to similar objection from Mr. Davis, of Massachusetts:

"The honorable gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Davis says there are no parties who can make a compromise. Wil lenator excuse me for saying that this remark smells too much of the technicality of Blackstone? No parties? Are there not great conflicting interests, conflicting opinions, pervading the whole country? Who are the parties in that greatest of all compromises, the Constitution of the United States? There were no technical parties to that instrument: but in deliberating upon what was best for the country, and perceiving that there were great and conflicting interests per vading all its parts, they compromised and settled them by ample concession, and in the spirit of true patriotic smity. They adjusted these conflicting opinions; and the Constitu-tion under which we sit at this moment is the work of their can only be settled by the spirit of mutual concession."

The year after the passage of the Missouri act the Missouri, who had availed themselves of its authority to form a State constitution, came with that constitution and presented it to Congress, claiming the admission of Missouri into the Union. But the constitution offered an unexpected obstacle to her admission. It contained a proviso, inserted inse pertently, as we are authoritatively informed by the chief historian of the compromise, preventing the migra-tion of free people of color into that State. Immediately nds rushed forth from every quarter, and the gallant ship of State would have been swallowed up in the raging mass of waters upheaved from their profoundest depths but for the efforts of her noble crew, and chiefly of him, the master spirit, the genius of America, the great pacificator, who spake with lips touched with a live coal from off the altar, and at whose bidding the winds retired to their caves and the waters became tranquil and quiet as a sleeping babe.

This brings to our view the second measure of the compromise-the resolution offered by Henry Clay, which was not the compromise itself, but a timely act of patriotism, maintaining and confirming it; and which amounted to nothing more or less, to use the simple language of its author in his speech of 1850, than "a declaration of an incontestable principle of constitutional law, that when the constitution of a State is violative in its provisions of the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the United States is to be paramount, and the constitution of the State, in that particular, is a nullity

Having given so much of the history of the compre mise, I will ask, sir, by whom was that compromise car-ried or effected? I say it was effected chiefly by Southern men, and that it was a Southern measure. This is a question of evidence, and must be treated as such. Mr. Clay, in his speech on his compromise resolutions

in 1850, speaking of the compromise line of 36° 30', says: "But I take the occasion to say that among those who "But I take the occasion to say that among those who agreed to that line were a majority of Southern members. My friend from Alabama, in the Senate, (Mr. Kirs.) Mr. Pinkney, from Maryland, and a majority of the Southern Senators in this body, voted in favor of the line of 35° 30'; and a majority of the Southern members in the other House, at the head of whom was Mr. Lowndes himself, voted also for that line. I have no doubt that I did also; but, as I was of the question of slavery:

Speaker of the House, and as the journal does not show which way the Speak r votes, except in the case of a tie, I am not able to tell with certainty how I actually did vote; but I have no earthly doubt that I voted, in common with my other Southern friends, for the adoption of the line of 36° 30'. So he matter ended in 1820."

Before proceeding further with the evidence, I will here correct what appears to me an error of fact in the report ed speech of the very eloquent and learned gentleman from Georgia. After correctly asserting that Mr. Clay was not the author of the prohibition of slavery north of 35° 30', the gentleman says: "He (Mr. Clay) did not vote for it." It appears to me that there is no authority or this positive assertion; but that indeed the proof is the other way; for Mr. Clay says "he has no earthly loubt he voted, in common with his other Southern friends, for the adoption of the line of 36° 30'."

The venerable and distinguished member from Missouri,

Col. Banton,) I quote from the National Intelligencer, in one of the chapters of his interesting work, recently given to the public, briefly reviews the history of the condense what I have to say, and must therefore request tire vote of the Senators upon the subject, and then adds: Missouri compromise, giving in the course of it the en-

"In the House there was some division among the Southern combers; but the whole vote in favor of it was 134 to 42 in the negative, the latter comprising some Northern members, as the former did a majority of the Southern; among them ne whose opinion had a weight never exceeded by that of my other American statesman, WILLIAN LOWNDES, of South

member of the Convention which framed the Constitution of of Missouri to hold a convention to form a constitution the United States; was a member of the Senate from 1798 and State government, as preliminary to the decision of till 1891, when he was appointed Minister to Spain by Mr. Congress upon the admission of Missouri as a State into Scheron; and subsequently represented South Carolina in Superior such compromise for the Union upon an equal footing with the original States, failed by a disagreement of the two Houses on the substance of Representatives from 1817 to 1821; all of which government of the Oregon Territory.

The House of Representatives was in the popularity in his native State. "-National Intelligencer of compromise measures of 1859, no public speaker or writer." the 20th February, ultimo.

CONGRESS HALL, MARCH 2, 1820,

and give the South, in a chort time, an addition of six, and per-haps eight, members to the Senate of the United States. It is CONSIDERED HERE BY THE SLAVEHOLDING STATES AS A GREAT TRICHPH. The votes were close-ninety to eighty-six, (the vote was so first declared)-produced by the seconding and ab-North and the South stood opposed to each other in sec-tional and sugry array: the North determined on pro-hibiting and the South equally determined on admitting of 35° 30' there is to be by the present law restriction, which you will see by the votes I veted against. But it is at preyou will see by the votes I veted against. But it is at pre-sont of no moment; it is a vast tract, uninhabited only by savages and wild beasts, in which not a foot of the Indian im to the soil is extinguished, and in which, according to the ideas prevalent, no land office will be open for a great length of time.

With respect, your obedient servant,

CHARLES, PINCKNEY. I will close the evidence by showing from the National Intelligencer of the 20th February the vote in Congress on the 5th section of the act of 6th March, 1820, and from Niles's Register the vote on the engrossment of the bill FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

"In the Senate there was an equal number of members from each section of the country, and every member voted upon the question. Of twenty-two Senators from the Southern States fourteen voted in favor of the restriction and eight against it; and of the Northern Senators, twenty voted in its favor and two against it.

"So also in the House of Representatives a majority of the

Southern members sustained the restriction proposed by the Senate. Of seventy-six Representatives from slaveholding States who voted on the question, thirty-nine recorded their names in favor of the substitute proposition and thirty-seem gainst it; whilst of the Representatives from the non-slaveolding States ninety-five voted in its favor and only five The entire vote was in the Senate, yeas 34, nays 10; and

in the House of Representatives, year 134, nays 42. The question was taken on ordering the bill, as amended, to be engrossed and read a third time, and decided by yeas and nays: yeas 24, nays 20.

FROM NILES'S REGISTER. "Among the twenty-four allimative votes were Barbour and Picasants, of Virginia: Brown and Johnson, of Louisiana; Eaton and Williams, of Tennessee: Elliott and Walker, of Georgia: Calliard, of South Carolina; Johnson and Logan, of Kentucky : Lloyd and Pinkney, of Maryland; King (the lat Kentucky: Lloyd and Pinkusy, of Maryland; King (the late William R.) and Walker, of Alabama; Leake and Williams, of Mississippi; Van Dyke and Horser, of Delawsre; and Stokes, of North Carolina; making twenty Southern Senators and four from the North. Mr. Macor, of North Carolina, and Mr. Smith, of South Carolina, were the only two Southern Senators who voted against that bill, while only four Northern Senators voted for it, and eighteen against it; and when it went to the House of Representatives it passed that body by a vote of one hundred and thirty-four to forty-two; forty Southern Representatives voting for it and thirty-seven against it. Thus was the compromise of 1829 brought about."

Volume 17, page 440. riew to their admission into the Union.

It was a concession to the South by the North which had originally contended for the ordinance of 1787 for Missouri and the balance of the Louisiana territory. It was a concession also by the North to the people of Mis- ana, the State from which I appear here as a Represen-

It has been said, for the purpose of influencing men's the bill. I deny it, sir; I deny it, and plant myself upon This understanding, this agreement, these concessions, the record. Mr. Clay was not one who deposited his this satisfactory settlement—all this constitutes, in my opinions on public matters mysteriously and secretly in mind, a compromise. Call it by what name you will, an the bosom of any private man. His mind and his heart act of legislation, a contract, a compact—procumque no- belonged to his country, and he spoke his sentiments mine gandet—it is a great act of compromise; a settle- freely and fully to his country and the world. What, sir, ment by those who had a right to make it; a settlement | did he say was the effect of the compromise of 1820? to their satisfaction; a settlement for national advan- Hear his words of the tranquillizing and healing nature tage, for peace and harmony, for fraternal consord, and of that measure, uttered while he was enforcing another and a later great compromise. Speaking on the late measure of compromise, he says:

"I refer to historical instances occurring in our Government to verify me in the conviction I entertain of the heal ing and tranquillzing consequences which would result from the adoption of this measure. What was said when the come adoption of this measure. What was said when the com-romise was passed? Then, as now, it was denounced. Then, as now, when it was approaching its passage, when being perfected, it was said: 'It will not quell the storm, nor give peace to the country.' How was it received when it passed! The bells rang, the cannons were fired, and every demonstra-

And he then adds some remarks which are so apposite the present occasion, so well calculated to take away all force from the appeals made to local prejudices, that I must be pardoned for reading and commending them the especial consideration of my Southern brethren:

"Nor is it true, as has been unkindly suggested, I think by the "Senator who sits by my left, (Mr. Hane,) that Northern men were obliged to remain at home, and incur the disbleasure of their constituents. There were Henry Baldwin of Pittsburg, Henry Storrs, of New York, and others, if had time to enumerate them, who voted for a settlement of the Missouri question, and who retained the confidence and affection of their respective constituents. I suppose the Scnator was understood, as I understood him, to throw out some thing by way of themase to Northern Senators, to make them swerve from the patriotic duty which lies before them of heal tion under which we sit at this moment is the work of their hands—a great, a memorable, magnificent compromise, which indicates to us the course of duty when differences arise which stances, but I speak of those of which I had a distinct recollection. Yes, sir, the Missouri compromise was received with exultation and joy. Not the reception of the treaty of pear negatiated at Chent, nor any other event which has occurred do ing my pergrass in public life, ever gave such unbounded and neveral estisfaction as the settlement of the Missouri compro-tise. We may argue from like causes like effects."

It may be said that the remarks I have quoted related o the resolution of compromise of Henry Clay. I answer y repeating that the resolution was nothing but a timely ad calming declaration of an incontestible principle of onstitutional law, and that its effect was to maintain, to

onfirm, and enforce the great compromise of 1820.

I have dwelt, Representatives, perhaps too long upon the topic of personal authority. But I know the power of the name of that illustrious citizen—a name dear and familiar to the friends of liberty in both the hemispheres, and whose fame is more than commensurate with the boundaries of civilization-a name to mention which, in an American assembly, is to open up the great fountain of national affection—a name identified with the history of the country, and as immortal as that Union of which is bearer was, for more than half a century, the boldest and most distinguished champion.

I have now reviewed the history of the Missouri com comise, shown the true nature and character of that apromise, proved that it was a Southern measure, carried by Southern votes, and that it was hailed as the haringer of peace and harmony to our distracted country as the restorer of amity and fraternal feelings between the people of all the sections of the Union.

When the Missouri compromise was adopted the United States owned no territory open to slavery except the Lousiana territory, purchased from France. It was accordingly considered as a great settlement, in the nature of fundamental compact, between the North and the South, on the subject of slavery. At that time no one dreameds of the vast acquisitions since added to our national domain. And from that period up to the present session strictive of the increase of slaves. the compromise has been regarded as complete and period only three millions, speaking in petual in its character in relation to slavery in the Lou-

"Third. New States of convenient size, not exceeding four number, in addition to said State of Texas, and baving sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of State points of said territory lying south of \$60° 30' north latitude, commently known as the Missouri compromise line, shall be admission of said territory lying south of \$60° 30' north latitude, commently known as the Missouri compromise line, shall be admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution and laws of the country.

But while this is our policy, this our determination, I can be considered with the prohibition, to expense of our plighted faith and our well-settled convictions on the Missouri compromise line, shall be admission under the provision of said territory lying south of \$60° 30' north latitude, comments are no sound reason of State policy, no wise and just comments are no sound reason of State policy, no wise and just comments are no sound reason of State policy, no wise and just comments are no sound reason of State policy, no wise and just comments are no sound reason of State policy.

The term "forever," connected with the prohibition, to the territory—in the territory—in the territory—in the territory—in the territory of Louisies. You sat upon us, in a case of the statute relates naturally and directly to that object.

The term "forever," connected with the prohibition, to the territory—in the territory—in the territory—in the territory—in the territory—in the territory of Louisies. You sat upon us a case of the statute relates naturally and directly to that object.

The term "forever," connected with the prohibition, to the territory—in the territory—in the territory—in the territory—in the territory of Louisies. You sat upon us a case of the statute relates naturally and directly to that object.

The term "forever," connected with the "Third. New States of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State in regard to them. This is our settled and deteristiction. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36° 30' north latitude, commently known as the Missouri compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire. And in such State on States as may be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri compromise line staverny or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be promisered."

Third. New States of convenient size, not exceeding four on carth, foreign or domestic, to invade the rights of any State in regard to them. This is our settled and deterious by the Constitution and laws of the country. But while this is our policy, this our determination, I can see no sound reason of State policy, no wise and just consideration of interest that would justify us in disturbing settled compacts and destroying the peace and harmony of the various sections of the Union. There are given additional territory in the belief or hope of effective and preserving a balance or equilibrium between

The parliamentary history of this transaction is exceedingly interesting, not only as proving the recognition of the Missouri compromise, but also as showing that the line of 36° 20' was adopted, in the instance, on motion of Mr. Douglas, the present Senator from Illinois, and that it was made applicable to States as well as Territories north of 30° 30'.

In a debate in the Senate in 1848, on the Oregon bill, Mr. Douglas, of Illinois, who has since, in a letter published in the newspapers, avowed himself the author of the present bill to repeal the Missouri compromise, offered an amendment which recognised the Missouri compromise, and which proposed to extend the line of 36° 30 through the Territory of Oregon. The amendment was voted for by all the Senators from the South and passed the Senate, but it was afterwards disagreed to in House. Most of the Southern Representatives voted for to have been a Southern measure, and the event put the seal upon that character by showing it to be acceptable to the Souther." it: but the majority of the House voted against it, because they were unwilling to extend the compromise line The next witness whose testimony I shall bring to of Missouri to the Territory of Oregon. This clear and tion and advancement of the interests of the South to a distinct vote of the House has been lately argued to be a repudiation of the Missouri compromise; but the argument is too flimsy to delude any well-balanced mind. A refusal to extend the Missouri compromise line to another territory than Missouri was not a repudiation of the Missouri enterprise and improving her agriculture; by encouraging and supporting appropriate souri compromise, about which all were agreed, but a manufactures within her limits; by caltivating the arts

compromise measures of 1859, no public speaker or writer spirit and developing their gentle qualities, and so form-of the South ever contended that the Missouri compromise ing and training them in all virtue, knowledge, and acwas, in any way or manner, connected with or affected y those measures.

the sovereign people, met in their several conventions, of their country and the world; and, lastly, by strength-and each soleanly approved and ratified the compromise coing the bond of national union through the observance measures of 1850-not, sir, licentiously declaring any law superseded or any compromise annulled and set aside, this wise policy that interest as well as fraternal harmony but honestly and patriotically proclaiming to their fellow-countrymen that they regarded the compromise, in prin-Constitution and Union to which they are indebted for ciple and substance, as a final settlement of the subject to their unexampled prosperity and progress. The true inwhich it relates; that they would maintain and insist on terests of all lie in union, mutual confidence, and harthe enforcement of the compromise measures, abiding by
and adhering to a faithful execution of them; and that
words of liberty—E Pluribus Unum—united we stand, dithey would discountenance any efforts to continue or renew the agitation of the questions settled, as having an mean, the agitation of the slavery question, are most auinevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the spicious for the welfare and happiness of this great and people and to endanger the integrity of the Union.

The compromise measures

sperous. Agriculture, under a bountiful Providence, republic! had righly rewarded the labors of the husbandman; commerce, in her spirit of enterprise, had pushed her peace-fallowed me, some of the arguments of the advocates of ful conquests, and opened new regions for profitable the bill. and for the spread of her beneficent influences; manufactures had found increased employment, and re-vived from their languishing condition; the fisheries, not-fusal to extend the line of 36° 30', or some such line, to with standing some differences, happily in the way of mu- | California. I have already partly answered this pretence tually advantageous settlement between our country and in my remarks in relation to the Oregon bill. But I am Great Britain, had left their rich fields open for the har-vests of our hardy and adventurous seamen; our relations who thought Congress had no right to legislate on the with foreign nations were peaceful and friendly; the subject of slavery in the Territories doubtless found a spirit of internal improvement was abroad in the land, sufficient ground for the refusal in that opinion; while making ways and facilities for trade and commerce and others, who thought, like Mr. Clay, that Congress had every species of useful intercourse, and binding the people | that power, but that it was impolitic to exercise it, as it of all sections more closely together in the bonds of fra- would, contrary to their views of the true policy of the ternal amity and good neighborhood; the arts and sciences nation, open the Territory to the admission of slavery, were steadily advancing; education, merality, and religion were informing, purifying, and elevating the people, stitution and laws of the country, and by the law of na-and crowning them with their multiplied blessings; and, ture in respect to the soil and climate, based their refusal above all, and as most conducive to all these, no agitating on those views of policy. But in the argument it was not and disturbing questions vexed the public mind, but pretended that the refusal to make the compromise of 36° peace and harmony, brotherly love and mutual confidence | 30' for California unmade, annulled, and repealed the and breadth of our great Republic.
Such was the happy condition of the country when the

their hearts from one another.

Mr. Chairman, good faith is the only basis of confi- pliedly allowed on the dence, the tie which holds men together in society in future territory, we should apply that line."

peace and amity. Good faith, with kindness, is the inpolitical egitators. Representatives from the Territory of Louisians, ceded by France. South and the North and the East and the West. I call compromise act provided merely for that Territory; an

voice had come up from the seaboard and the cities, no was a matter of special contract. complaint or petition had proceeded from any State Legislature calling for the disturbance or repeal of the Misouri compromise.

aneous peace offering from the North to the South. Gentlemen of the South, do not suffer yourselves to be de-luded by this unfounded and audacious pretence. By whom was the author of this abominable measure em powered to present himself to the country as the emboliment of the North, to act in her behalf and to speak the one of joy throughout the whole land was made upon the other than Missouri compromise."

by the press in tones of wounded affection, of friendly remonstrance and expostulation, not unmixed with a just emonstrance and expostulation, not unmixed with a just and natural indignation against the proposed outrage on good faith. It daily sounds in our ears through the proceedings of public meetings, of numerous associations of whole communities of intelligent men. of patriotic

State Legislatures, presented to this House.
In addition to the public evidence of Northern sentiment, I have seen letters from the most distinguished citizens of the North addressed to friends on this floor de precating the agitation of the slavery question as inju ous to the peace of the country and the stability of the Union, and appealing to the patriotism of the South to discountenance and repress it.

Sir, the movement of the repeal did not originate i Northern sentiment, nor was it proposed in the Nebraska oills first introduced into Congress. It was an afterthought, an unhappy after-thought, which stands before the country condemned by the judgment of some of its supporters previously pronounced against the very agitation it has produced.

The pretence that the proposition for the repeal of the Missouri compromise is a voluntary and spontaneous offer from the North to the South, however unfounded, is yet a clear admission that the repeal was not demanded or asked for by the South. But I go further and say that, practically, and apart from the consideration of good and the consequences that would result from its breach, the South had no interest to move in the matter of slavery in relation to the Territory mentioned in the

It is conceded that the climate of the Territory so far north is uncongenial to the slave, and that the soil is not suitable for the production of those great staples, cotton sugar, and rice, in the culture of which his labor can be profitably employed. Under these circumstances, and considering the cheapness of land, it is certain that very few slaves would be carried there. Moreover, the land being well adapted to free labor, would naturally attract to it a large influx of free white laborers, and the Terri tory would soon become populous. A constitution, therefore, upon the organization of the Territory into a State would in all probability be adopted excluding the further admission of slavery into the State, and providing for the emancipation of the slaves in it at the time of the adoption of the constitution. Hence, for all practical pur poses, slavery would be as effectually excluded from the Territory as if it were expressly prohibited by law.

And now, I would ask, what motive has the South to extend the area of slavery within the present limits of the Republic? Such an extension would not furnish desirable lands for slave labor, nor would it lead to an increase the slave population. We of the South already have ands sufficient for culture by our slaves beyond any number they can possibly increase to in a long series of ages; and it is well known that the policy of the country is re-The number of slaves is only three millions, speaking in round numbers; and the slave trade is declared piracy by law. The process of emancipation, too, is constantly going on; and freed-

ing settled compacts and destroying the peace and har-mony of the various sections of the Union. There are great matters of national and international adjusing and preserving a balance or equilibrium between them and the non-slaveholding States. But this is a vain

and delusive hope.

The fact cannot be disguised that slavery in our counry cannot keep pace with the growth of the white race. It was demonstrated by Mr. Calhoun himself in his last speech delivered on the compromise measures of 1850, on the 4th of March, and is confirmed still more strongly by the tables of the last census. And this is owing not only to the nature of things, but to the established policy of the Government. In addition to the natural and extraordinary growth of the free population under our liberal institutions, the emigration from all parts of the world is pouring its copious streams over the country; and these streams, for the most part, find or make their channels in the new States.

"Westward the course of empire takes its way."

The wise and sagacious Southern statesman, under these circumstances, will not look forward for the proteccomplishments as to qualify them for all honorable and useful labors, and to render them, as I am proud to say In 1851 the two great parties of the country, composing their progenitors have ever been, the lights and ornaments of good faith, and making our Northern brethren feel in Congress assembled this year in the spirit of the wise have been faithfully executed, and the fires of patriotism men of the two conventions, and under the brightest burn bright in every section of the country. May we be auspices. All the great interests of the country were wise enough not to disturb this happy condition of the

I now propose to examine, according to the short time

It is insisted by some of the supporters of the bill that revailed in the breasts of men throughout the length compromise for Missouri. No one advocated such an ab-

It has been urged by a gentleman of distinguished abidemon of Discord leaped into our Eden, and introduced lity that "the principle embodied in the Missouri com-the subject of slavery to agitate men's minds and to turn promise was this: 'That a line in the Territories should be selected, and slavery excluded on the one side and imother; and that, as we acquired

dissoluble bond of brotherhood. Sir, the Missouri com- that principle, according to my judgment, was the clear promise has performed its holy work of pacification and undoubted right of Congress to legislate for the Terunion. For thirty-four years it has kept the Louisiana ritory. Now, the only Territory we then had, the destiny territory as consecrated ground from the intrusion of fanupon you, in the name of your country, to maintain the no one at the time dreamed of new territorial acquisifaith of your forefathers. Repeal-or, to borrow the new- tions. The assertion, then, that the Missouri comprofangled language of the day, declare superseded—one commisse line was to be applied to all future acquisitions is promise, and you open the door for the overthrow of every without any evidence to support it. It is a petitio princicompromise; and, looking to consequences, I fear for the pii. The compromise line of 36° 30' was not a principle, overthrow of that most glorious of compromises, the Contitution of these United States. This, I believe, will be strife and disunion; not a provision with a view to future the sentiment of the people of the United States after due acquisitions, but a settlement of the question of slavery reflection. I am assured and am happy to believe that it is the sentiment of several leading papers of Louisiana. In the Territory of Louisiana. The idea of the adoption of the geographical line to be applied to new territory for But, sir, whatever may be the sentiments of others, it is all time to come, as heretofore observed, is an aftersentiment, and I utter it here this day, in my place, thought, springing out of the views of certain gentlement as a national Representative, under all the responsibilii in respect to the rights they claim for the South. But it ties that rest upon me, without the least regard to any consequence merely personal to myself.

has not been acquiesced in or admitted by the North, as we see in the case of the Oregon Territory and of the ter-Sir, the clause in the bill in relation to slavery has ta-ritory recently obtained from Mexico. Nor does the line ken the people by surprise. No primary meetings had of 30° 30′, in the case of Texas, vary or affect my posibeen held in the agricultural districts of the Union, no tion; for that was stipulated in the joint resolution, and

Upon the unfounded assumption that the application of a certain line to all future acquisitions was the principle of the Missouri compromise, the fallacious argument is But it is said that the repeal is a voluntary and spon- made that the late compromise act which rejected that

application is a repudiation of the Missouri compromise. The reasons for the rejection have been already set orth, and have been shown to be, practically, the exist ing Mexican law excluding slavery, and the climate and soil of the acquired territory, which rendered it unfit for slave labor. Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster, by whose leadher sentiments and feelings? No, sirs, no; the voice of ing influence the compromise measures were carried, both the North is clear and loud against the repeal. It speaks insisted upon these grounds, and both expressed their opposition to the extension of slavery in the new Territory. After pressing upon the South the truth that the adoption of a line would be a recognition of the power of Cengress to legislate for the Territory, to which doctrine the South, in the main, avowed its opposition, Mr. Clay said of a line :

"I have said that I never could vote for it myself, and I re peat that I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote, to spread slavery over territory where it does not exist."

And he added these correct and conservative remarks, which gentlemen should carefully weigh, as maintaining good faith in compromises: "Still, if there be a majority who are for interdicting slavery

north of the line, there ought to be a majority, if justice is done to the South, to admit slavery south of the line. And if there on majority to accomplish both of these purposes, although connot concur in their action, I shall be one of the last to cre-te any disturbance; I shall be one of the first to acquiesce in hat legislation, although it is contrary to my own judgment and to my conscience."

Mr. Webster's views were equally explicit. In his wise, cloquent, patriotic, magnanimous American speech of the dexico as "free by the arrangement of things ordered by the Power above us;" and he continued :

"I have therefore to say, in this respect also, that this country is fixed for freedom to as many persons as shall ever live in it by a less repeniable law than that which attaches to the right of holding slaves in Texas." And again:

herever there is a foot of land to be prevented from becom-

wherever there is a substantive good to be done

wherever there is a toot of fand to be prevented from becom-ing slave territory—I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837. I have been pledged to it again and again, and I will perform these pledges; but I will not do any thing unnecessarily that rounds the feelings of others, or that does discredit to my own And he thus concludes this portion of his speech : "Now, Mr. President, I have established, as far as I pro posed to do, the proposition with which I set out, and upon which I intend to stand or fall; and that is, that the whole

in the case of Texas without a violation of public faith, and by no human power in regard to California or New Mexico; that therefore, under one or other of these laws, every foot of land in the States or in the Territories has already received a fixed and decided character." From these views of the leading friends of the com romise measures it is clear to me that there was no in-

erritory within the former United States, or in the newly-equired Mexican provinces, has a fixed and settled charac-

, now fixed and settled by a law which cannot be repealed

from which slavery was excluded by express law. of Missouri to form a constitution and State government, &c. "was intended to apply to all organizations of government, States or Territories." But this appears to me a palpable error. "All the territory" is a limited expres-

But while this is our policy, this 'our determination, I can see no sound reason of State policy, no wise and just consideration of interest that would justify us in disturbing settled compacts and destroying the nease and here. ana, for which the regulation was made. It is a word of solemn formality, and is often used in the settlement of to show the intention of the parties to be to make a final and permacent settlement.

It is asserted that the Missouri compromise was repealed by the compromise of 1850; but I know of no roof, no argument, or authority that sustains the asser-

The compromise of 1820 was an exercise of the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territory of Louisiana, and it was a settlement of the question of slavery in that Territory satisfactory to the North and the South.

The compromise of 1850 was an understanding or agreeant not to legislate on the subject of slavery for the ter-tory acquired from Mexico, and it was a satisfactory ritory acquired from Mexico, and it was a satisfactory settlement to the North and the South.

Now, the agreement not to legislate is not to be con sidered a repudiation or denial of the power of Congress in relation to slavery in the Territory. On the contrary, we know that the compromise of 1850 was carried by the votes and influence of men like Clay and Webster, who boldly and constantly avoid that Congress the state of the tribled and marks sed and excited, if sectional prejudice and fanaticism, and all the evil passions that in relation to slavery in the Territory. On the contrary, we know that the compromise of 1850 was carried by the votes and influence of men like Clay and Webster, who boldly and constantly avoid that Congress the state of the tribled and marks sed and excited, if sectional prejudice and fanaticism, and all the evil passions that I fear, boldly and constantly avowed that Congress had the power to legislate for the Territory. The not legislating was the compromise of 1820.

no language of repeal. They make no mention of, nor what is called a Northern quarter. When did the South do they allude to, the compromise of 1820. When Mr. need such prompting? Was not her honor safe in her Webster found himself obliged to vote for an uncalled for own hands, in her own sense of honorable justice, and in and unnecessary amendment offered by Mr. Soule, from her own gallantry? True honor is quick and sensitive; Louisiana, providing that the States formed out of New it is true to its own holy impulses; it obeys its own Mexico and Utah should have the right and privilege of instincts; it allows no dictation; it spurns the mockery making their own constitutions, and of presenting those of an unauthorized boon. How is it that the chivalric of the United States, with or without a prohibition the setting aside of the Missouri compromise? against slavery as the people of those Territories when it that the gallant spirits of the other Southern States, about to become States may see fit, he said he voted for it exactly on the same grounds that he voted against the rights, to be roused from their slumbers by the stentorian introduction of the proviso. "And let it be rememberand Utah and other Territories acquired from Mexico, and or NOTHING ELSE." &c.

only to have an effect in the Territories for which they south to maintain that faith and uphold that honor. were enacted. The language of those acts leaves no room. To Representatives from the North I would respect. for doubt. It is specific, and confined in terms to those fully say a few words before parting. You are engaged Territories. It fixes boundaries, and sets forth, in a proviso, the ground taken, as already mentioned, in regard a party. Upon the observance of good faith in our nato slavery. It neither asserts nor suggests any idea of a tional compromises; upon a just public sentiment, accomrelation to any pre-existing Territory; nor does it under-take authoritatively to lay a basis of government for fu-pends. Manifest, then, your devotion to the Constitution ture Territories that may be acquired. The true character of these acts has, in my judgment, been perfectly described in the wise and patriotic speech of an illustrious son of Massachusetts, (Mr. Evenerr,) published in the cause is righteous, and will be best advanced by a wise

supersede or repeal the compromise of 1820, I desire to avoid the sharp retort, the bitter sarcasm, the ungenerous the late compromise measures. I believe these measures ciation of excited and over-wrought disputation. God had their origin in a spirit of mutual concession, of fra-knows, gentlemen, I speak not these things in any spirit ternal feeling and patriotism. I believe they happily restored peace and harmony to the country, which had been distracted by sectional strifes and dissensions; and I believe, if faithfully executed, as they have been up to the and I trust not unworthily, on the high matter involved commencement of the present agitation, they will secure in the consideration of this bill. the protection of Southern rights in regard to slavery. and perpetuate the blessings of union to the whole country. But, while I entertain these opinions, I feel it my duty to declare that I have no doubt whatever of the power

of Congress to legislate on slavery outside of the States and within the Territories. The arguments of the constitutional lawyers of the national school-Clay, Webster, and others-on this subject are familiar to the House, and leave nothing to be said upon it. The power rests upon impregnable grounds-the authority expressly vested in Congress to make the necessary "rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States," and the treaty-making power, from which the power of acquiring territory is derived. Besides, the question has long been practically settled. But the sands of my glass have nearly run out, and I must hasten on towards a conclusion.

The advocates of the bill argue that the compromise of therefore supersedes and repeals the compromise of 1820. But aware that if this be conceded the Louisiana Territory would still be left, on their own principles, under the mountains, and a few feet from where it emerges it the operation of the treaty and the local law of Louisi- forms a pool deep enough to swim in, then passes above ana, which, they say, guaranty slavery, and that this and under the ground across the road, and forms a large state of things would be equivalent to the action of Con- lake which cover gress in favor of slavery, they have proposed an amendment to the bill, which declares, in substance, according | Salt Lake, twenty miles distant, is a saturated solution to my understanding of it, that the Territory shall be henceforth held and deemed released and set free from city. subject to the action and control of the people of the Territory in the formation of a State Constitution. Now, I submit that the amendment proposes an act of inter-vention, to wit, the annulling of the existing law, and are to be seen in it several islands, which are mountainthat it is, therefore, inconsistent with the doctrine of non-intervention which, it is said, is established by the mpromise of 1850. If it be said that the effect of the amendment is to put the Territory on an equal footing both as respects slaveholders and non-slaveholders, I answer if this be granted the amendment is still an act of nature of a contract in favor of slaveholders. In these emarks I do not intend to be understood as approving the doctrine that the treaty between the United States and France, and the law of the portion of the Territory ahabited at the time of the ratification of the treaty, are to be considered as establishing a law on slavery in the vast uninhabited portion of the Territory. Such a document with pink, and blue belts; 10th, a dragoon company trine is, in my opinion, wholly untenable. France stipulated for the existing property of her subjects within her inhabited territory, and for the speedy incorporation of those subjects into our Union as citizens; but she never ontemplated, and the United States never would have consented, that the policy of the United States in respect to slavery in the land to be occupied should be controlled and settled by her royal will. The object of my argument on this point is to show the inconsistency of the

advocates of the bill on their own premises.

Inflammatory appeals have been addressed to the South, used on the assertion that the South has a right to carry slavery into any of the Territories of the country. I have already expressed my opinion as to the power of Congress o legislate on slavery outside of the States and within the Territories. But let us take the assertion as true, and make a practical application of it to the Missouri ompromise matter, and see whether there is any just omplaint on the part of the South in relation to it.

The South claims a constitutional right to carry slavery nto a Territory south or north of 36° 30'. But the North claims and has an equal right to admit her sons also into a Territory whether south or north of 36° 30'. Here, then, is a clashing of interests. In this state of things the question prises: Is it a violation of the Constitution for either of the parties to forbear to exercise its right ! that is to say, for the South to limit the exercise of her right to the south of the line of 36° 30', and for the North to limit the exercise of her right to the north of the line of 36° 30'? Such a forbearance, it is submitted, is not violation of the Constitution; and of this nature is the

Missouri compromise. It is arged, with great earnestness upon the North that Nebraska and Kansas will certainly be free States; that the position of the South on the present bill is not, pracically, one of power or interest, as respects these Territories, but one of feeling and honor, involving her views of her just and equal rights in the Union; and that the repeal of the Missouri compromise is therefore a mere honorary concession which the North ought, in a spirit of justice and fraternal consideration, unhesitatingly to make.

To this address the North replies: "In 1850, only four years ago, we settled between us, in a spirit of amity and nutual concession, all complaints and differences growing out of the subject of slavery. The comprom tention to go back to the Missouri compromise, and to adopted has been faithfully executed, and has been atfriends of the Union. There is now no difference between It has been argued that the prohibition in the eighth eection of the act authorizing the people of the Territory the Union; it has stood for thirty-four years, and is consecrated in our affections: it is a monument of the conservative character of our republican institutions; it is bond and covenant by which you have profited, and which you are bound, as well as ourselves, faithfully to keep men and even slaves are every day transported to Liberia at the expense of a liberal portion of our citizens, and at the expense of a liberal portion of our citizens, and the subject. Congress could not put a restriction as to the subject to give the terms employed their obvious and reasonable of political justice; but we claim and expect to the maintain it, and our faith to maintain it, and our faith is our word of honor. We differ with you as to the subject. Congress could not put a restriction as to the subject to maintain it, and our faith is our word of honor. We differ with you as to the powers of the Government in relation to slavery, and we are conscientiously opposed to the extension of slavery. We have all due respect for your feelings and them under our own care and government, subject to our faith to maintain it, and our faith is our word of honor. We differ with you as to the powers of the Government in relation to slavery, and we are conscientiously opposed to the extension of a statute is to look to the object in view and them under our own care and government, subject to our faith to maintain it, and our faith to

tions of national policy. Under these circumstances we cannot accede to your propose, and must insist upon the faithful maintenance of the ompromise of 1820."

Representatives, in this codition of affairs, this difference of opinion between bothers, it becomes us to act with moderation and wisom, with an equal and tender regard to the feelings of both parties, and with an eye single to the honor, the peace, and welfare of the whole country. We should arefully eschew the language of reproach, of taunt, and defiance. Harsh epithets provoke recrimination, and tempestuous passion stifles the voice of reason. Ye have all one common object, the good of our common country. We are one people, and good of our common country. We are one people, and have one destiny. In my mind and my heart American liberty is inseparable from American union. Let us nof then deceive orselves. The question before us is a questo be torn open and to bleed afresh, if the minds of men are to be triubled and harassed and excited, if sectional

the opinions and feelings of those who denied the power of classified for the Territory on the subject for classified for the Territory on the subject for slavery in a case in which, as has already been shown, slavery was excluded by express law, and by the still more powerful law of nature. This policy of inaction has been erroneously styled the reinches of non-to disturb this happy condition? The questions in relaintervention, and is represented as an active power, over-tion to slavery had all been settled. No acquisitions of ruling the right of Congress to legislate for the Terri-tories. In this way it is now solemnly proclaimed by the bill that the compromise of 1850 supersedes and repeals faith of the nation, pledged in the great conventions of the people against the agitation of the slavery questions, But the compromise measures give no warrant for this is so little heeded, so soon forgotten or repudiated? An sumption of facts and this reasoning. They contain appeal is made to us in behalf of Southern honor from language of repeal. They make no mention of, nor what is called a Northern quarter. When did the South constitutions to Congress conformably to the Constitution | sons of South Carolina did not step forward to propose voice of a leader from a non-slaveholding State? added he, "that I am now speaking of New Mexico | are significant questions, and the answer to them is clear. Southern honor rested upon Southern faithupon Southern faith pledged to the Missouri compromise; The compromise measures, it is clear, were intended and now I rely upon the sober second thought of the

peal of or any interference with any previous act in panied with honest action, the permanency of our Gov journals of this city.

And now that I have shown the true character of the compromise of 1850, and that that compromise does not be fraternal. Reason, explain, persuade; but carefully avoid the sharp retort, the bitter sarcasm, the ungenerous distinctly understood as approving and maintaining and insulting invendo, and the fierce and savage denunof vanity or dictation, but from the bottom of my heart,

THE CITY OF SALT LAKE.

Extract from a Letter of Lieut. J. MITCHELL BRONANGH, now of California, to his brother, J. W. Bronaugh, Jr., dated Salt Lake City, July 25, 1852.

"Salt Lake City is situated some three miles west of the Eastern range of mountains that bound the valley. The city is regularly laid out, in form that of a right angle. The squares are immense, and each house has an acre or more of ground attached to it. The houses are built of sun-dried bricks, called adobes, generally one-story high, but there are many two-story houses, and a few threestory. There are two sulphur springs in the vicinity of the town, one of which is the warm sulphur, temperature that of the blood, or 98 degrees by the thermometer. This spring is some two miles north of the town. The 850 establishes the principle of non-intervention, and hot sulphur is two miles north of the warm sulphur; temperature near the boiling point. This spring is a perfect curiosity. It issues from the base of a rock at the foot of ticed duck, curlew, snipe, &c. on the margin of the lake. of salt. It is in view from almost any point without the The Mormons collect all their salt from this lake. the treaty and the local law in favor of slavery, and be It is from 250 to 300 miles in circumference and very shallow, and is slowly receding; indeed, where there is such an extensive evaporating surface, the Lake will, in process of time, dry up; there is no doubt of it. There ous, and from the distance I see them they look as high as any that you see surrounding the basin.

"Yesterday was the anniversary of the arrival of the ioneers of Mormonism in the valley of the Great Salt Lake. The procession was formed as follows: 1st. Field music; 2d, the American flag; 3d, a long line of regislation, an act of intervention, and that it is inad-classible to arrive at the desired end—the repeal of the mers bearing bundles of wheat and oats; 5th, a long line ompromise of 1820—by means subversive of laws in the ature of a contract in favor of slaveholders. In these was inscribed 'Zion's Daughters,' 'our children are our glory;' 6th, grown girls, in white, with straw hats and blue sashes; 7th, twenty-four young men, in black frock coats and white pantaloons; 8th, twenty-four small boys, in yellow jackets and white pants; 9th, twenty-four liton foot, blue frock-coats, white pants, Kossuth hats and plumes; 11th, the bishops of the Mormon church, in ong gowns, each bearing a banner with suitable inscrip-Before each company a banner was carried. In this formation the procession moved through the principal streets, and then went to the residence of Governor Young and escorted him to the Tabernacle. The Govook post with his Counsellors and the Apostles in front of the Bishops. Arrived at the Tabernacle, songs and speeches were sung and made; after this the procession left the church, and was dismissed opposite the State House. Salutes were fired during the Temple Block, which is unbailt, except its southeastern face, occupied by the Tabernacle.

"The Tabernacle is a singular affair, some sixty feet wide by upwards of one hundred in depth. It is one story high, shelving roof, with no openings on its flanks. On both its north and south fronts it has two doors and two windows. The interior presents an arched appearance; there are no passages, the whole floor being occupied by pews. I attended church last Sunday, and the remarks from those who spoke were just such as you hear in the States. The essential difference between the Mor mens and others is that the Mormons go in for an unlimited number of wives. A man can have as many wives as he can conveniently support and satisfy. Gov. Young has his full share, and has them quartered in different parts of the town. The State House is a very creditable edifice, two stories high, and upwards of forty feet square; the first story is of red rock, second of adobe, and plas tered red and white, to correspond with the first story. The Legislature meets here, and the Courts hold their

sessions here. "Gov. Young's residence is the neatest in town-two stories high, built of adobe, and plastered a light lead

"The Mormons treat us kindly, and profess attachment to the Government of the United States. They look upon Judge Brocchus as the author of the illiberal reports concerning them. I never was in a place in my life in which apparently morality of the most rigid kind s practised like you see it here. There are no bandy ouses in the town, and swearing on the streets is punished by a heavy fine. Contrary to my expectations, I find on inquiry the Americans are in a large majority in the Mormon population. Americans fall all the offic

MAKING RELIEVE "WORKING MRN."-A class has risen ip amongst you (the working classes) who get their living by agitation and organization. They toil not with their hands, but with their tongues. The beer shop is their factory and home. The loom and the plough know them not, yet they always affect to speak in the name of the working classes. - Boston Post.

DEEP SNOW .- The Portland Advertiser says the snow storm of Thursday last was one of the severest of the "winter storms." In some places the snow fell to the depth of two feet, so that on Friday the trains could not